REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-80, 107–130, 147 and 148 are in this Application. Claims 81-106 and 131-146 have previously been cancelled.

Claims 1-80, 107–130, 147 and 148 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1 and 73 have been amended herewith.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-72 and 110-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ginter et al. (US Patent No. 5,892,900), hereinafter "Ginter", in view of Gilmour (US Patent No. 6,205,472) hereinafter "Gilmour".

Claims 73-75, 78-80 and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of by Ronning (US Patent No. 5,903,647), hereinafter "Ronning" in view of Gilmore.

Claims 76 and 77 are rejected over Ronning in view of Gimour and England.

Claims 107-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being obvious in light of "Java Security: How to Install the Security Manager and Customize Your Security Policy" (hereinafter "Venners") in view of Gilmour.

Regarding claims 1 and 110, the claim recites:

a) monitoring a user's actions on said computer workstation; see claim 1, line 3.

Examiner rejects this feature on the basis of Ginter column 1 lines 20–30.

Applicants argued in the previous response that Ginter does not teach monitoring a user's actions on a computer workstation.

It is respectfully noted that Examiner appears not to have related to this argument.

Applicants respectfully repeat this argument.

Specifically Ginter column 1 lines 20–30 teaches:

The invention also relates to secure chains of handling and control for both information content and information employed to regulate the use of such content and consequences of such use. It also relates to systems and techniques that manage, including meter and/or limit and/or otherwise monitor use of electronically stored and/or disseminated information. The invention particularly relates to transactions, conduct and arrangements that make use of, including consequences of use of, such systems and/or techniques.

Applicants believe that there is nothing in the above passage that relates to monitoring of user's actions, contrary to the requirements of the claim.

The feature a) is *not* an isolated feature but is in fact *tied in with the continuation of the claim*, since it is the *monitored user actions* which are *compared with the policy*. This tie-in is thus *also* absent from the citations.

An example of what the claim requires is described in the present Application. A user presses the print button. The pressing of the print button by the user is monitored against a policy to determine whether the information may be printed or is restricted from printing.

That is to say the above - cited passage contains no teaching of the claimed feature, or even a hint at its existence. Neither for that matter is there any hint at a need for such a feature. Furthermore the feature, even if provided, would not solve any problem or fulfill any useful function in either of the cited documents.

Applicants in fact wonder whether the reference was erroneous and the Examiner intended some other passage. Applicants have diligently checked the Application but can find no such passage, and respectfully await the Examiner's further guidance on this point.

Thus Ginter *fails* to teach the claimed feature of

"monitoring a user's actions on said computer workstation".

This feature, absent from Ginter, is not taught by Gilmour either.

Applicants believe that this feature is not within the scope of the contribution that the skilled person is able to make, since there is no evidence of a problem in Ginter that it would solve. The same applies to Gilmour.

Thus the combination of Ginter and Gilmour fails to teach claim 1.

Specifically the combination of Ginter and Gilmour fails to teach that *user actions* should be *detected and compared* to a *policy* that is associated with the *statistically identified confidential information*.

On the basis of the above argument alone it is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is novel and inventive over the citations.

Claim 110 has the corresponding feature of

    i) a monitor configured for monitoring a user's actions on said computer workstation, said actions being associated with content;

Again, Ginter teaches no such monitor, certainly not in the passage cited. Gilmour does not add the information missing in Ginter.

Thus claim 110 is respectfully believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 73 is rejected based on a combination of Ronning and Gilmour.

Ronning teaches a method of self-launching an encrypted digital system. It indeed provides a level of protection for the encrypted digital system, to ensure that it cannot be used until paid for.

Gimour teaches using statistical techniques to identify information.

Examiner's rejection as understood by the applicant is that it is obvious to add the statistical identification of Gilmore to the encryption of Ronning to provide confidential information that is protected following statistical identification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the skilled person starting with Ronning would not need to identify the information that needs protection. In Ronning the information is already contained in the self-launching system, so it is *already identified and already protected*.

Thus the skilled person wishing to *protect confidential information that is not yet identified* – the problem of the present invention – would *not* consider Ronning in the first place.

Even if he did consult Ronning, he would not then consult Gilmour because Ronning has already identified the information. Therefore the statistical identification of Gilmour does not solve any problems that Ronning leaves outstanding.

In any event the combination of Ronning and Gilmour is not believed to make sense. Ronning provides information that is already protected by encryption. So why go to Gilmore to learn a method of identifying information that is already identified?

Even after making the combination, the combination still lacks the feature of determining a policy. In Ronning the information is *already encrypted*. That is to say a protection measure is already in place. There is no *determining* of a policy, contrary to the requirement of the claim, since the purpose of the policy is to set out which protection measures should be put in place.

Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claim to further require that the policy is a requirement to be enforced by the terminal. In Ronning the encryption provided by the self-launching distribution system is the single measure that is provided, and that is clearly excluded by the amended wording.

Thus it is respectfully submitted that the amended claim 73 is novel and inventive over the prior art.

Claim 107 teaches inter alia feature a)

"detecting an event occurring at said workstation, said event being associated with content;"

Examiner, in rejecting this feature, points to Venner, and the heading "The Security Manager and the Java API.

This passage teaches that a sandbox is used to enforce a security policy. The security policy may include a list of features such as accepting a socket connection or closing an application.

Applicants respectfully point out that there is not a whisper of *detecting an event associated with content*. The passage pointed to *does not mention content*, does not mention events associated with content and does not in fact mention *events* at all.

Thus the later feature of using statistics to identify the content, is also not fulfilled by the prior art since "the content" refers to that which was associated with the detected event, and *no content* is *associated* by Venner with *any* detected event.

Specifically, Gilmour, which teaches generally using statistics, fails to add to Venner that the statistics should be used to identify the content associated with the event, since neither Venner nor Gilmour ever associate content with an event.

Thus claim 107 is respectfully believed to be inventive over the cited prior art.

No new matter has been added in the course of making the present amendments. It is believed that all of the matters raised by the Examiner are overcome.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.   Examiner: Thomas A. GYORFI
Serial No.: 10/748,178   Group Art Unit: 2435
Filed: December 31, 2003   Attorney Docket: 27153
Office Action Mailing Date: November 16, 2009   Confirmation No.: 5563

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-80, 107-130, 147 and 148 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56,437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: February 25, 2010

Enclosures:
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE); and
- Petition for Extension (One Month)